

INDIANA LEGISLATURE.

[Omissions and curtailments of this report for want of space in these columns will appear in an appendix to Volume XXIII of the Brevier Legislative reports.]

IN SENATE.

Tuesday, March 31, 1885.

APPELLATE COURT.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the Five Judge Appellate Court bill (S. 373), the question being on the motion (Mr. Fowler) to recommend with instructions, pending at the adjournment yesterday.

Mr. MAGEE resisted the motion, and contended that five Judges for such a court as the one proposed is none too many. Upon general principles, all agree there should be another Court. If this bill passes it will be eminently satisfactory to the Bar of the State, while the Supreme Court Commissioners have not been, because an intermediate court is imperatively demanded.

Mr. OVERSTREET: Realizing that the Supreme Court needs some relief, I should regret to vote against any such measure; but I think three Judges will be sufficient, and do more business than has the Commission of five Judges. I have no doubt but in a few years the number of the Supreme Court Judges will be increased to seven, and if this Appellate Court is made to consist of three we will have ten Judges.

Mr. FOWLER: I insist three Judges are sufficient. By sitting in bank they can do about the work of five Judges, and that is what this bill provides for. I think it is a stretch of constitutional power to create the Supreme Court Commissioners. No Appellate Court will ever be on a plane with the Supreme Court, even were equal talent on both. It is the experience of legislation that when an office is created it can not be dispensed with. I will not vote for any court bill of this kind, but if this bill must pass let it pass with but three Judges.

Mr. YOCHE: We are proposing to establish a court to mete out justice as between citizens that has no more stability than a statute of the State. When it comes to the courts there should be a firmer foundation than a mere statute. A resolution has been introduced to increase the number of Supreme Judges, and if it passes the relief can be had in a little over two years. The pressure upon that court has been relieved, and we can wait until two years more. The fact that this would be a statutory court is sufficient reason for me to vote against the bill.

The motion to recommend was rejected by yeas 10, nays 25.

Mr. BROWN: I am opposed to the passage of the bill, but will vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. FAULKNER: I am opposed to this bill, but if we have to let it take its course in small doses as possible. A few years ago Judge Bunker did the business of the courts in three counties for \$1,000, and now it costs some \$7,500, and Judge Bunker did the business of ten counties that now cost \$10,000. The increase in population and business does not justify this. I vote "aye" now, but will vote "no" on the whole business.

Mr. FOWLER: I am opposed to the bill, but will vote "no" when the bill came upon passage.

Mr. MCINTOSH: Before discussion I was in favor of but three Judges, after the speech of the Senator from Cass, I was almost inclined to favor five Judges, but after the speech of the Senator from Lake I don't know but I am opposed to the bill. I vote "aye" on this.

Mr. SMITH, of Jay: Judges are the guardian angels of the property and liberty of the people, and are the most poorly paid of all public servants. On the amendment I vote "no."

Mr. YOCHE: Should vote against the bill but for this amendment.

So the motion to recommend was rejected.

On motion by Mr. WEIR the bill was ordered engrossed by yeas 20, nays 15.

HUNTING ON UNTILLED LANDS.

The Senate proceeded to consider the special order—Mr. Weir's bill (S. 230), the question being on the motion (Mr. Macys) to strike out Section 1.

Mr. WEIR was willing this amendment shall be made, as the second section was sufficient to accomplish the purpose desired.

Mr. SMITH, of Jennings, regarded the bill as unconstitutional and in derogation of the right of property.

Mr. SMITH, of Jay: I think the first section ought to become a law. It is not the policy of the State to allow clubs or any person to hold large bodies of land to the exclusion of citizens of this State. I am in favor of a bill that will prevent the purchase of large tracts of land to be held exclusively for hunting purposes. I think it would be constitutional and a proper statute.

Mr. FOWLER: The principle of the bill is correct, but we ought not to apply this principle to take away rights already acquired, and in my opinion we can not do it. This thing has gone too far, and should be stopped.

Mr. WEIR: The people of my county are being frequently arrested because they have hunted on grounds belonging to a Chicago, Pittsburg and New York Club, or some gentleman of great fortune. This demands some remedy at the hands of the Legislature.

Mr. CAMPBELL, of Hendricks: It seems to me the object of this bill is to permit hunting on enclosed lands owned by others. I shall vote against this bill, but would vote for an amendment to the statute so as the principle may apply to lands not used for agricultural purposes. The owner of lands can use it for any purpose that is not immoral.

Mr. YOCHE: This bill would affect my county very largely. I have my doubts about the constitutionality of this bill.

Mr. OVERSTREET: I don't think this bill can be amended so that the Legislature would or ought to pass it. The land upon which is fit for nothing but duck and muskrat. I think when we come to the secret of this bill it is to protect sporting men in hunting on other men's land. They had better remain at home attending to business. It seems to me this bill ought to be voted down at once.

Mr. FOWLER moved to add a section excluding from the provisions of this bill all lands heretofore purchased.

Mr. FOWLER: regard this bill as vicious and pernicious, and would indefinitely postpone it and everything connected with it.

The motion was rejected by yeas 11, nays 32.

Mr. Campbell, of Hendricks, voted "no" that a chance may be had to amend as he suggested.

Mr. FAULKNER: I don't think this bill ought to pass under any consideration. I think a man has just as much right to buy land to raise ducks or fish on as to raise any thing else. I have a fish pond, and am afraid this bill would allow any one to take fish from it.

Mr. MAGEE: I am opposed to this bill, but refuse to vote for the indefinite postponement.

Mr. SMITH, of Jennings: I think the principle of the bill is right, but I think it is unconstitutional. If the statute of 1881, Sections 2,110 and 2,111, were amended the whole subject could be covered. I vote "no."

Mr. ZIMMERMAN: In order to give the

poor man a chance to hunt and fish, I vote "no."

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. HILLIGASS: The substitute does not reach the question, but virtually leaves the law as it now stands. The bill is the kind of law that ought to be passed.

On motion by Mr. WEIR the bill and substitute were recommitted.

On motion by Mr. Benz, another vote was taken on his bill (S. 161) to authorize subpoenas for witnesses to be issued in vacation to attend the Grand Jury, which heretofore failed to pass for want of a constitutional majority.

The bill passed by yeas 20, nays 16.

Mr. WINTER, explaining: The effect of this bill will be that the fees will be charged to the county and paid out of the County Treasury.

Mr. YOCHE: I believe the bill contains a good principle, but I believe it will enable the Sheriff to charge fees on every subpoena issued, therefore I vote "no."

Mr. Duncan, of Brown, for similar reasons changed his vote.

So the bill passed.

BREVIER LEGISLATIVE REPORTS.

On motion by Mr. BAILEY the bill (S. 360) to pay for Bravies Reports heretofore submitted, ordered, accepted and bound by the State, was taken up and passed by yeas 27, nays 14.

ENVELOPE BALLOT.

On motion by Mr. MARSHALL his Envelope Ballot bill (S. 173) was read the third time and passed by yeas 20, nays 14.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Senate concurrent resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution so that the Supreme Court shall consist of seven Judges was rejected by yeas 18, nays 19.

Mr. BENZ: I am opposed to amending the Constitution, besides I think five Judges are enough. I vote "no."

Mr. CAMPBELL, of St. Joseph, said there were provisions of the bill that he would like to support, but as the bill now stood it had contradictions and ambiguities and impractical features that would make it the cause of litigation and inoperative in its object of ditching. He thought that as the Drainage Commissioners are entirely under control of the Judge of the Court he ought to appoint and not the Board of County Commissioners. Section 1 provides removal by the Board of Commissioners, while Section 2 permits the Court to remove. The two Commissioners first appointed shall give bond and may be objected to for cause, but no provision is made for the third Commissioner to give bond or to be objected to, yet this Commissioner may have charge of the work and handle money. No provisions are made that assessment shall be ratable on the assessment as were the provisions of the old law. The provision requiring the contracts to be in divisions of not more than 100 feet is a burden some. Ditching must begin from the lower end. If a contractor must be impeded every 100 feet by some one who is slow, it would be very great detriment, it ought to require representation of at least one-half the land to set aside a ditch by remonstrance. When another other than the remonstrator is appointed he should be required to turn his notes over to the surveyor for preservation. In keeping ditches open ten days is not long enough to give the surveyor, especially as he might have other work to do and could not get to the ditch, and the bill made him liable, besides, to pay the attorney fees of the plaintiff; and showing cause for neglect did not constitute a defense. He called attention to the ambiguity as to who should make assessments for clearing a ditch, and as to who should determine whether or not the land of the owner, and that the forms for application were left out of this bill which would compel the employment of an attorney.

Mr. MOON spoke in favor of the passage of the bill.

Mr. MAGEE: This is in the nature of a domestic bill. It authorizes taking private property for public use. Such a law must be arbitrary, and made so it can be enforced against any one individual who may object. There are some provisions in this bill I feel I must condemn by my vote. It is the duty of the Legislature to adopt laws that will develop the resources of the State. The great objection to this bill is that it will require an adjudication of every question that will come up under it. It is bad policy to change laws that the Supreme Court has adjudicated upon. Every question that could grow out of the present ditch law has been settled, and the friends of the bill have shown where it is superior in all respects to the present law. It would incur a great expense to the people to litigate these new questions. If the present law is disturbed except to amend it where experience has shown it needs amendment, the whole system will be upset. These drainage laws have done more than any other to add to the wealth and prosperity of the State. The people have become familiar with them, and if another law is enacted the many questions will have to be readjusted.

Mr. HILLIGASS: I am heartily in favor of this bill. Its object is to provide a better and an equitable system of drainage. But one objection has been made to this bill, except a general one. The interest of the people in the northern part of the State require the passage of this measure, as the present law has proved to be unsatisfactory.

Mr. YOCHE: I signed the committee report with the statement if a bill must pass I would rather see this one, as amended, than the one that came from the House, but I should oppose this. The most serious objection is a two-thirds remonstrance would defeat a ditch, though the aggregate amount of assessment may be only \$50, and while the aggregate amount on the other side may be \$5,000. There seems to be as dangerous notice required as possible. If by accident all lands are not included in the petition, the petitioners must again pay for serving notice. There are other objections to this bill.

Mr. CAMPBELL, of St. Joseph, moved that the bill be recommitted with instructions to report the present law, with the provisions in this bill for appointment by Commissioners, for service of notice, and four others.

Mr. HILLIGASS: I hope this motion will not prevail. I demand the previous question.

The Senate seconded the demand, and under its operations the motion to recommit was rejected by yeas 13, nays 21.

The bill passed by yeas 32, nays 11.

Mr. CAMPBELL, of St. Joseph: I believe the drainage of this State would be in a better condition if the present law were repealed than were this bill to pass.

Mr. DRAY: I concede there are two or three objections to the present law, but this bill is so unjust and so unfair I vote "no."

Mr. MACY: I am satisfied that this bill would encourage litigation, and therefore I vote "no."

So the bill passed.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Tuesday, March 31, 1885—9 a. m.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY.

The SPEAKER: The unfinished business is the consideration of the amendment by the gentleman from Tippecanoe (Mr. Smith) that there be added to the appropriation

bill \$14,750 for new buildings for Purdue University.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I move to amend by adding the words that no part of the money shall be used for salaries for the faculty.

Mr. SMITH, of Tippecanoe: I accept the amendment.

Mr. DEEM: I offer as a substitute for the amendment that the sum be \$12,500 instead of \$14,500.

Mr. SMITH, of Tippecanoe: I have been consistent on the floor in standing by all the State institutions. Long before the gentleman from Putnam (Mr. Gordon) had completed his college education Tippecanoe County had given more to Asbury University than any other county. I represent a noble people, who are no beggars. They had a proposition and submitted it to the State, and it was accepted. It has been said here by the gentleman from Putnam (Mr. Gordon) that he would be willing to vote the whole property to Tippecanoe County. That can not be done, for the State is pledged in its compact to the United States to support Purdue as an educational institution.

Mr. HAYDEN: I think too much time has already been taken up on this—nearly four days. If there is a man in Indiana who can make a success of Purdue, Professor Smart is that man. Connected with him is a number of men. A vast amount of money has already been expended. The ability of the faculty should be continued. Professor Smart said to me that the new buildings were needed. As it is, the students are compelled to work in the cellars.

The previous question was moved by Mr. HAYDEN, and being seconded by the House, under its operations the substitute for the amendment was adopted by yeas 68, nays 22.

Mr. CORY, explaining his vote, said: I was in favor of giving Purdue \$14,750; but as those nearest the institution seem willing to take \$12,000, I vote "aye."

Mr. GARRISON: All the State institutions Purdue University is foremost. I vote "aye" on this proposition.

Mr. HAYDEN: The friends of the University are willing to take \$12,000, so I vote "aye."

Mr. HOBAN: The money seems to be needed, and it would not injure the State's Treasury to give this sum. I vote "aye."

Mr. SMITH: The substitute was thrust upon me without my foreknowledge. But we will accept the sum and Tippecanoe County will meet it. I vote "aye."

Mr. ADAMS: I wish to change my vote, and doing so will explain. As some seem to be afraid that Purdue is likely to get a little money, and are fighting every inch to prevent it, I vote "aye."

The SPEAKER: After that remark I shall explain my vote, and I shall vote "no" on the proposition. If these buildings are needed the State should pay all of it. I am not an enemy to Purdue University. I do not believe in this thing of the State making an appropriation to export money from any locality. It should pay the whole sum or none.

So the substitute was adopted.

Mr. WILLIAMS moved to amend the substitute that the money should, if secured at all, be taken in 100 days.

On motion by Mr. FLOYD the amendment was laid on the table by yeas 13, nays 23.

Mr. ADAMS, explaining his vote, said: This is a scheme to defeat the appropriation. An idea prevails that Tippecanoe County can not raise their part of the money in 100 days.

Mr. REEVES: This amendment is unfair and I vote "aye."

Mr. SMITH, of Tippecanoe: If Purdue should not get a cent I will oppose this. I vote "aye."

Mr. LOYD: That I may be recorded as not favoring a single dollar or a single cent to Purdue I vote "no."

So the amendment was laid on the table.

On motion by Mr. SMITH, of Tippecanoe: I move the adoption of the amended substitute.

The motion was agreed to by yeas 68, nays 24.

Mr. GOODING, explaining his vote, said: Because of the compact between the State and the United States to support this institution, because it is a college for farmers and mechanics, I vote "aye."

Mr. GORDON: Because there is no compact between the State and the United States regarding this, because it is not an agricultural college, I still have the courage to vote "no."

Mr. HARRELL: Because the reports of the institution show that the management is violating the compact in not sustaining it as an agricultural college, because this money is wanted to extend an institution not an agricultural college, I vote "no."

Mr. MURPHY: Because I do not believe it is the province of legislation to go beyond the common schools, and because I believe this unjust to a majority of the taxpayers, I vote "no."

Mr. MCROOME: Because our people do not want this money appropriated, and because, though the State is within ten miles of Tippecanoe County, yet our children go to other colleges, I vote "no."

Mr. MCGOVNEY: Because the people are already overburdened with taxation, and because this is not just, I vote "no."

Mr. MCHENEY: I see a chance to give Purdue at least a small allowance. The educators are looking not up to us, but down upon us. I vote "aye."

Mr. MCMICHAEL: This is not a question of sentiment but of the taxpayer. It is an outrage on the people of Tippecanoe County and of the State in general. I vote "no."

Mr. TOWNSEND: Because I believe that the strength of a people depends upon its education, and because I believe that the more money we spend for educational institutions the less we will spend for prisons, I vote "aye."

Mr. WILLIAMS: There are many reasons why I vote as I do. One reason is that the advocates of Purdue have defeated the amendment prohibiting the use of this appropriation for the payment of salaries to professors. I believe a part of this appropriation will be used for that purpose. They first told us the \$11,000 was the least amount they would accept for building purposes, yet it is developed that they will take anything they can get. They want it for salaries, therefore I vote "no."

So the substitute was adopted.

Mr. GORDON offered an amendment that the salaries of the President be \$2,500 and that of the Professors \$1,500 per year.

On motion by Mr. SMITH, of Tippecanoe, the motion was laid on the table by yeas 54, nays 20.

Mr. HAYDEN, explaining his vote, said: Because the trustees should regulate the salary and not the State, I vote "aye."

Mr. ROBINSON: Though the salary of \$2,500 is reasonable enough, yet the trustees should regulate the salary. So I vote "aye."

Mr. STALEY: Because the trustees should by all means regulate the salary, I vote "aye."

On motion by Mr. McMULLEN the bill was ordered engrossed.

OLEOMARGARINE.

Mr. SCHMIDT, from the Committee on Manufacturing, reported back the bill (S. 271) prohibiting the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine, recommending that it be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. REEVES moved to lay the report of the committee on the table.

The motion was rejected—yeas 43, nays 43.

Mr. BEST, explaining his vote, said: It has been claimed that it is unconstitutional to prohibit the manufacture and sale of liquors; I vote "no."

Mr. GOODING: For the protection of those who are imposed upon at hotels by this I vote "aye."

Mr. KELLISON: For the reason that not one in a thousand would use oleomargarine, if they knew it, I vote "aye."

Mr. LOYD: Because I think that the bill can be so amended that it can be passed, I vote "aye."

Mr. MOCK: I do not believe in destroying one industry to build up another. But as I think that oleomargarine is not healthful, I vote "aye."

Mr. MAUK: Because oleomargarine is as healthy as butter and as healthy as beef, I vote "no."

Mr. MURPHY: Because bad butter is worse than oleomargarine, and because the latter is healthful, I vote "no."

Mr. MCGOVNEY: Oleomargarine is next to and as pure as your beefsteaks. You can not tell it when properly made. I vote "no."

Mr. MCMICHAEL: In the northern part of the State is an important manufactory, which makes the best quality of oleomargarine. I do not believe in destroying that industry. I vote "no."

Mr. PATTEN: It is made of putrid stuff, mostly, and is unhealthful. I vote "aye."

Mr. REEVES: Because there is a general demand for it, I vote "aye."

Mr. SEARS: Because we have a statute which says that no man shall sell it unless it is properly labeled, and because I believe in letting a man buy it if he chooses to, I vote "no."

Mr. DEEM: For the reason that a large number of my constituents have petitioned for the passage of this bill, and for the further reason that it is favorable to the farmers, dairymen and the sanitary interests of all the people, and for the further reason that oleomargarine is often manufactured from rotten tallow, rancid mutton suet and dead cholera bugs, impurities which no chemical analysis can determine, I most emphatically vote "aye."

The SPEAKER: I do not much like the bill as it is, but in response to the petition of my constituents I vote "aye."

So the motion was rejected.

Mrs. Tom Thum is to be married to Count Mayri on Easter Monday at the Church of the Holy Trinity in New York. Distinguished persons will be present. Miss Lucy Adams will act as bridesmaid, with Major Newell, the husband of the late Minnie Warren, will fill the position of bridegroom. After Mrs. General Tom Thum's present engagement is finished she will start for Italy, where she will probably settle down for the remainder of her life. This little bit of a widow has mourned over her loneliness since Tommy died.

The average weight of carcasses of American cattle has been increased by over 33 percent. of the weight of fifty years ago, while the average weight of milk is even greater.

Thousands Hastened to Their Graves.

By relying on testimonials written in vivid, glowing language of some miraculous cures made by some largely puffed up doctor or patent medicine has hastened thousands to their graves, the readers having almost insane faith that the same miracle will be performed on them that these testimonials mention, while the so-called medicine is all the time hastening them to their graves. Although we have

Thousands Upon Thousands!!

of testimonials of the most wonderful cures voluntarily sent us, we do not publish them, as they do not make the cures. It is our medicine, Hop Bitters, that makes the cures. It has never failed and never can. We will give reference to any one for any disease similar to their own if desired, or will refer to any neighbor, as there is not a neighborhood in the known world but can show its cures by Hop Bitters.

A Losing Joke.

A prominent physician of Pittsburgh said to a lady patient who was complaining of her continued ill health, and of his inability to cure her, jokingly said: "Try Hop Bitters!" The lady took it in earnest and used the Bitters, from which she obtained permanent health. She now laughed at the Doctor for his joke, but he is not so pleased with it, as it cost him a good patient.

Fees of Doctors.

The fee of doctors at \$3 a visit would tax a man for a year, and in need of a daily visit, over \$1,000 a year for medical attendance alone! And one single bottle of Hop Bitters taken in time would save the \$1,000 and all the year's sickness.

Given Up by the Doctors.

"Is it possible that Mr. Godfrey is up and at work, and cured by so simple a remedy?" "I assure you it is true that he is entirely cured, and with nothing but Hop Bitters, and only ten days ago his doctors gave him up and said he must die from Kidney and Liver trouble!"

None genuine without a bunch of green hops on the white label. Shun all the vile, poisonous stuff with "Hop" or "Hops" in their name.

TEST YOUR BAKING POWDER TO-DAY

Brands advertised as absolutely pure CONTAIN AMMONIA.

THE TEST: Place a tea spoon of powder in a small cup, add a few drops of water, and stir. A chemical will not be required to detect the presence of ammonia.

DR. PRICE'S CREAM BAKING POWDER

Does not contain ammonia. No healthfulness has never been questioned. In a million homes for a quarter of a century it has stood the consumers' reliable test.

THE TEST OF THE OVEN.

PRICE BAKING POWDER CO., MAKERS OF Dr. Price's Special Flavoring Extracts! The strongest, most delicate and natural flavor known, and Dr. Price's Lupulin Yeast Food Gums

For Light, Healthy Bread, The Best Any Hop Yeast in the World.

FOR SALE BY GROCERS. CHICAGO. ST. LOUIS.

DUFFY'S PURE Malt Whiskey.

Absolutely Pure and Unadulterated. Entirely Free from FUSIL OIL.

FUSIL OIL.—Do you know what it is? Ask your Physician or Druggist and he will tell you that IT IS A DEADLY POISON. Positive Cure for Malaria, Pulmonary Complaints, Indigestion, Nervous Prostration, Bronchitis, General Debility, Loss of Vitality, and all Wasting Diseases. Endorsed by over 3,500 Physicians and Chemists. Invaluable as a STIMULANT AND TONIC in Typhoid Fever, Dysentery, Diarrhea, and all low forms of Disease.

THE RECOGNIZED ANTIDOTE FOR CHOLERA.

We are the only ones in the United States who are selling to the Medical Profession and Drug Trade an absolutely Pure Malt Whiskey, one that is free from FUSIL OIL and that is not only found on the sideboards of the best families in the country, but also in the physician's dispensing room.

DR. ARENDT, the great German Chemist, says:—"I have made an analysis of your PURE MALT WHISKEY, which gave a very gratifying result. Your Malt Whiskey, obtained mostly by extract of malt and water and a very careful fermentation and distillation, is entirely free from fusil oil and any of those similarly obnoxious alcohols which are so often found in cheap whiskeys. I therefore, RECOMMEND IT TO THE MEDICAL PROFESSION."

Prof. VON YONDER, writes:—"Purity itself is Duffy's Malt Whiskey. The purest liquor that I have analyzed. I most highly recommend it to the medical profession."

The late HARVEY L. BYRD, M.D., President of the Faculty and Professor of the Baltimore Medical College, says:—"I find it remarkably free from fusil oil and other obnoxious alcohols, so often found in the whiskey of the present day."

JAMES J. O'DEA, M.D., of Staten Island, the author of several works on medicine, writes:—"I prescribe an alcoholic stimulant, and especially in Typhoid, Pneumonia, etc."

moose Malt Whiskey. I know it to be wholesome, clean and unadulterated."

FRED H. SAWERS, M.D., of Rochester, N. Y., a graduate of the leading European colleges, and who prescribes your Malt Whiskey in his practice here, writes:—"I have used it in many cases of fever, with hearty recommendation. It is in low states of fever, with inflammation, and depressing malarial generally, and also as a tonic in febrile depression and convalescence from acute diseases, where an alcoholic stimulant is indicated, and especially in Typhoid, Pneumonia, etc."

IN FACT, IT IS A BEVERAGE AND MEDICINE COMBINED. TO CONSUMPTIVES. WE WILL ON RECEIPT OF SIX DOLLARS, send to any address in the United States (East of the Rocky Mountains), all Express Charges prepaid a plain case (the case is made of wood) containing SIX QUART BOTTLES of our PURE MALT WHISKEY and with it in writing, and under the Seal of the Company, A SURE AND POSITIVE CURE FOR CONSUMPTION and other WASTING DISEASES in their early stages. This Formula has been prepared especially for us by the great German Scientist, Dr. Von Fouders. It can be prepared by any family housekeeper at slight expense (Raw Beefsteak and our PURE MALT WHISKEY being the ingredients) and is a most valuable remedy in all cases of consumption in patients suffering from Consumption and the like diseases, get covered with a thick coating of fat and muscle, the sunken and bloodless cheeks fill up and assume a rosy hue, the drooping spirits revive, the muscles of the body, and chief among them the heart, are stronger and better able to perform their functions, because of